

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Figure 6 has been amended. A replacement sheet for Figure 6 is attached with this  
Amendment and Response.

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-49 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated February 6, 2008, claims 1-49 were rejected. Applicants are amending claims 1, 3 and 30 in this Amendment and Response. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

### **Objection to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to as allegedly failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). Specifically, the Examiner indicates that the reference character 690 in FIG. 6 is not mentioned in the description. Applicants submit a corrected drawing sheet for FIG. 6 herewith to remove the reference character 690 from the figure. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the figures.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 112**

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the external media processing device” in claim 2. Claim 1 has been amended to now recite “the external media processing device”. Therefore claim 1 now provides sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation is recited in claim 2.

### **Response to Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1-49 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-49 of copending Application No. 10/813,847 in view of Ishikawa. However, Applicants have amended the claims to now

include limitations different than those claimed in the copending application. In the event that the Examiner continues to maintain the double patenting rejection, Applicant requests that this rejection be held in abeyance until it is determined that there is allowable subject matter.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 6, 12, 14, 29-32, 38, and 40 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama and U.S. Patent No. 5,987,226 to Ishikawa. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A system for printing time-based media, the system comprising:  
a media processing system for executing a time-based media processing task for determining an electronic representation of the time-based media wherein the media processing system resides at least in part on a multimedia printer and at least in part on an external media processing device; and  
a resource allocation module for allocating the time-based media processing task between the portion of the media processing system residing in the multimedia printer and the portion of the media processing system residing in the external media processing device;  
an interface within the multimedia printer for receiving time-based media from an external source and being communicatively coupled to send the time-based media to the media processing system; and  
an electronic output system within the multimedia printer in communication with the media processing system to receive the electronic representation, the electronic output system producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media.

A system for printing time-based media includes a media processing system, a resource allocation module, an interface, and an electronic output system. The interface receives time-based media from an external source for processing by a media processing system that resides in part on a multimedia printer and in part on an external processing

device. A resource allocation module allocates the time-based media processing task between the multimedia printer and the external media processing device. An electronic output system within the multimedia printer outputs an electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media.

The cited references each fail to disclose or suggest a system having a resource allocation module for allocating a time-based media processing task, as claimed. Sugiyama discloses a video printer that allows a user viewing a video to select frames for printing. In order to print an image, the user selects a memory key 21 to freeze a displayed image and then initiates printing with a print key 23. (col. 4, lines 45-54). Sugiyama does not use multiple processors and would therefore have no need for a resource allocation module for allocating processing of a time-based media processing task, as claimed.

Ishikawa discloses a printing system having a first processor 1, a second processor 1', and a third processor 1''. A printing job division means 9 divides rasterization processing between the processors 1. (Ishikawa, col. 3 lines 16-39). However, the printing job division means 9 does not allocate a **time-based media processing task** between a portion of the media processing system residing the multimedia printer and a portion of the media processing system residing in an external system. Rather, Ishikawa only allocates a rasterization task consisting of obtaining picture element information for printing based upon a source file. The source file is not time-based media, nor does the rasterization task constitute a time-based media processing task. Furthermore, although Sugiyama receives time-based media, Sugiyama only discloses executing a function on individual frames of the video (i.e. a delete function). Sugiyama does not disclose performing any **time-based processing task** on the media. Therefore, even if Ishikawa and Sugiyama could be combined,

the combination still does not disclose or suggest allocating a time-based media processing task, as claimed. For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-4, 6, 12, 14, 29-32, 38 and 40 are patentable over the cited references.

The remaining dependent claims have further been rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama and Ishikawa in various combinations with U.S. Patent No. 6,167,033 to Chang; U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1 to Hymel; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 A1 to Stevens; U.S. Patent No. 5,170,935 to Federspiel; U.S. Patent No. 6,118,888 to Chino; U.S. Patent No. 6,308,887 to Korman; U.S. Patent No. 5,270,989 to Kimura; U.S. Patent No. 5,136,363 to Takemasa; and U.S. Patent No. 6,000,030 to Steinberg.

The cited references each fail to disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations previously discussed. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite additional elements that also are patentably distinguishable from all cited combinations of the above references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to the remaining dependent claims and withdraw them.

**Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-49, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Peter E. Hart et al.

Date: May 6, 2008

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /Jason E. Amsel/

Jason Amsel, Agent of Record  
Registration No. 60,650  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650)-335-7692  
Fax: (650) 938-5200